UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/606,057	06/28/00	GHAUVEL	TIF-15767A.1

TM02/0509
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
ATTN WILLIAM E HILLER
P O BOX 655474 M/S 219
DALLAS TX 75265

EXAMINER	
TRAN, D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	6

DATE MAILED: 05/09/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/606,057	GHAUVEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Denise Tran	2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 February 2001* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) *6-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. *07/902,191* .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *4* .
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 6-13 are presented for examination.

2. The rejections with respect to claims 26-33 are withdrawn due to the applicant amendment filed 2/27/01.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Claesson et al., A Multi-DSP Implementation of a Broad-band Adaptive Beamformer for Use in a Hands-free Mobile radio Telephone, pages 194-200, 02/1991, (hereinafter Claesson).

As per claim 6, Claesson teaches the invention as claimed, a cellular phone, comprising: a first processor (e.g., page 195, line 7 and et seq.); a second processor coupled to the first processor (e.g., page 195, line 7 and et seq.); a third processor coupled to the first processor (e.g., page 195, line 7 and et seq.).

As per claims 7, 10-11, and 13, Claesson teaches wherein the first processor is the main processor (e.g., page 195, line 27 and et seq.); wherein the second processor is a dedicated processor adapted to bit processing (e.g., page 195, line 12); wherein the third processor performs signal processing on vectors (e.g., page 197, line 6 and et seq.); and wherein three processors operate in parallel (e.g., page 196, col. 2, line 31 and et seq.)

As per claims 8-9 and 12, Claesson teaches the first processor performs management (e.g., page 195, line 27 and et seq.) and matrix computations (e.g., page 196, line 1 and et seq.). Claesson does not specifically teach the first processor for performing vocoder signal processing, the second processor for performing protocol processing, and the third processor being a dedicated processor of array processor type. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of having a processor for performing vocoder signal processing are well known and expected in the art . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the first processor for performing vocoder signal processing because it would allow voice processing to be performed, thereby increase system functionality and performance. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of having a processor for performing protocol processing are well known and expected in the art . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the second processor for performing protocol processing because it would allow protocol processing to be performed, thereby increase system functionality and performance. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of having a processor being an array

processor are well known and expected in the art . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the third processor being a dedicated array processor because it would allow parallel computations on large arrays, thereby increase system computation power.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Denise Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-9823.

The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday from 8.30 a.m. to 6.00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful the examiner's supervisor Matt Kim can be reached on (703)305-3821. The fax phone number for this group is (703)305-9731.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

D.T.

Denise Tran

05/01/01

MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100